

### REMARKS

Claims 44-48, 51-53, 61, 64, 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levers in view of Hochstein. Claims 49 and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levers in view of Hochstein and Zettler. Claim 54 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levers and Hochstein. Claims 55 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levers in view of Hochstein and Watanabe. Claim 57 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levers in view of Hochstein and O'Farrell. Claims 58 and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levers in view of Hochstein, O'Farrell, and Hasch. Claims 60, 62, and 63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levers in view of Hochstein and Zettler.

Applicants have incorporated into claim 44 the subject matter of claims 53 and 54. The subject matter of these now-canceled claims cannot be inferred from the combination of Levers and Hochstein. In Hochstein, as was commented before, the signals of ambient light sensor 22 are used for the correction of the values of rain sensor 20. Thus, to one skilled in the art, there exists no kind of suggestion to activate or deactivate the illumination devices as a function of these signals.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Dated: 9/29/06

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON LLP  
  
By: SONG LEE for Gerard Messina  
Gerard A. Messina  
Reg. No. 35,952

One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 425-7200